

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO**

ANTHONY R. MARTINEZ,

Plaintiff,

v.

No. 16cv637 JCH/KK

COUNTY OF BERNALILLO,

Defendant.

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER**

**THIS MATTER** comes before the Court on *pro se* Plaintiff Anthony R. Martinez' Application to Proceed in District Court Without Prepaying Fees or Costs, Doc. 2, filed June 22, 2016 ("Application"), and on his Civil Rights Complaint Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, Doc. 1, filed June 22, 2016. For the reasons stated below, the Court will **GRANT** Plaintiff's Application and **DISMISS** the Complaint **without prejudice**. Plaintiff shall have 21 days from entry of this Order to file an amended complaint. Failure to timely file an amended complaint may result in dismissal of this case without prejudice.

**Application to Proceed *in forma pauperis***

The statute for proceedings *in forma pauperis*, 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a), provides that the Court may authorize the commencement of any suit without prepayment of fees by a person who submits an affidavit that includes a statement of all assets the person possesses and that the person is unable to pay such fees.

When a district court receives an application for leave to proceed in forma pauperis, it should examine the papers and determine if the requirements of [28 U.S.C.] § 1915(a) are satisfied. If they are, leave should be granted. Thereafter, if the court finds that the allegations of poverty are untrue or that the action is frivolous or malicious, it may dismiss the case[.]

*Menefee v. Werholtz*, 368 Fed.Appx. 879, 884 (10th Cir. 2010) (citing *Ragan v. Cox*, 305 F.2d 58,

60 (10th Cir. 1962). “[A]n application to proceed *in forma pauperis* should be evaluated in light of the applicant's present financial status.” *Scherer v. Kansas*, 263 Fed.Appx. 667, 669 (10th Cir. 2008) (citing *Holmes v. Hardy*, 852 F.2d 151, 153 (5th Cir.1988)). “The statute [allowing a litigant to proceed *in forma pauperis*] was intended for the benefit of those too poor to pay or give security for costs....” *Adkins v. E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Co.*, 335 U.S. 331, 344 (1948). While a litigant need not be “absolutely destitute,” “an affidavit is sufficient which states that one cannot because of his poverty pay or give security for the costs and still be able to provide himself and dependents with the necessities of life.” *Id.* at 339.

The Court will grant Plaintiff’s Application to Proceed in District Court Without Prepaying Fees or Costs. Plaintiff signed an affidavit stating that he is unable to pay the costs of these proceedings and provided the following information under penalty of perjury: (i) his monthly income is \$0.00; (ii) he is unemployed; and (iii) he has no assets. The Court finds that Plaintiff is unable to pay the filing fee because he is unemployed, he has no income and no assets.

#### ***Dismissal of Proceedings In Forma Pauperis***

The statute governing proceedings *in forma pauperis* requires federal courts to dismiss an *in forma pauperis* proceeding that “is frivolous or malicious; ... fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted; ... or seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief.” See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). “Dismissal of a *pro se* complaint for failure to state a claim is proper only where it is obvious that the plaintiff cannot prevail on the facts he has alleged and it would be futile to give him an opportunity to amend.” *Kay v. Bemis*, 500 F.3d 1214, 1217 (10th Cir. 2007). “In determining whether a dismissal is proper, we must accept the allegations of the complaint as true and construe those allegations, and any reasonable inferences that might be

drawn from them, in the light most favorable to the plaintiff.” *Kay v. Bemis*, 500 F.3d at 1217. The Court looks to the specific allegations in the complaint to determine whether they plausibly support a legal claim for relief, i.e. the factual allegations must be enough to raise a right to relief above the speculative level. *See id.* at 1218 (*quoting Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544 (2007)). Dismissal of an *in forma pauperis* complaint as frivolous is not an abuse of discretion based on a determination that the *pro se* litigant did not state a viable legal claim and that the complaint consisted of little more than unintelligible ramblings. *Triplett v. Triplett*, 166 Fed.Appx. 338, 339-340 (10th Cir. 2006). However, “*pro se* litigants are to be given reasonable opportunity to remedy the defects in their pleadings.” *Hall v. Bellmon*, 935 F.2d 1106, 1110 n.3 (10th Cir. 1991).

Plaintiff filed his Complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and named the County of Bernalillo as the sole defendant. Complaint at 1. The factual allegations in the Complaint, in their entirety, are:

I was sentenced on 03/07/13 and was given a unsatisfactory discharge. I was to serve a term of 18 months with a 1 year parole term, or 527 days in the Department of Corrections. I was then served with a 1st Amended Judgement and sentenc[e] was done reflecting 2 yrs parole. I was never told about this being done and have never been in front of Judge Judith K. Nakamura, so I served more than m[y] time, something like 8 or 9 months passed my original sentence.

Complaint at 2 [sic]. Plaintiff attached 46 pages of documents related to his conviction, sentencing and incarceration to his Complaint. *See Doc. 1-1.*

The Court will dismiss the Complaint against the County of Bernalillo without prejudice because Plaintiff’s Complaint fails to state a claim. “To hold a local government liable under § 1983, a plaintiff must prove: “(1) a municipal employee committed a constitutional violation, and (2) a municipal policy or custom was the moving force behind the constitutional deprivation.”

*McLain v. Sheriff of Mayes County*, 595 Fed.Appx. 748, 753-753 (10th Cir. 2014) (citing *Myers v. Okla. Cnty. Bd. of Cnty. Comm'rs*, 151 F.3d 1313, 1318 (10th Cir.1998) and *Monell v. Dep't of Soc.* \*754 *Servs.*, 436 U.S. 658, 694 (1978)). “A ‘single isolated incident’ does not prove the existence of an unconstitutional policy or custom.” *Id.* (citing *City of Okla. City v. Tuttle*, 471 U.S. 808, 821, 105 S.Ct. 2427, 85 L.Ed.2d 791 (1985)). Plaintiff has not alleged any facts showing that a Bernalillo County employee committed a constitutional violation or that a Bernalillo County policy or custom was the moving force behind the alleged constitutional violation.

Plaintiff may file an amended complaint within 21 days of entry of this Order. Failure to timely file an amended complaint may result in dismissal of this case without prejudice.

### **Service on Defendants**

Section 1915 provides that the “officers of the court shall issue and serve all process, and perform all duties in [proceedings *in forma pauperis*]”). 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d). Rule 4 provides that:

At the plaintiff’s request, the court may order that service be made by a United States marshal or deputy marshal or by a person specially appointed by the court. The court must so order if the plaintiff is authorized to proceed in forma pauperis under 28 U.S.C. § 1915 or as a seaman under 28 U.S.C. § 1916.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(c)(3).

The Court will not order service of Summons and Complaint on Defendant at this time. The Court will order service if Plaintiff timely files an amended complaint which states a claim.

**IT IS ORDERED** that Plaintiff’s Application to Proceed in District Court Without Prepaying Fees or Costs, Doc. 2, filed June 22, 2016, is **GRANTED**.

**IT IS ALSO ORDERED** that Plaintiff’s Civil Rights Complaint Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, Doc. 1, filed June 22, 2016, is **DISMISSED without prejudice**. Plaintiff may

file an amended complaint within 21 days of entry of this Order.

  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**